

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending in the application. The Examiner objected to Claims 3 and 4 because of the informalities. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, but it is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner finds Claims 3-5 to be allowed if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over James et al. (U.S. Patent 6,369,847) in view of Jouppi (U.S. Patent 6,346,950).

Claims 3 and 4 have been amended above for informalities. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended in an effort to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112. Claims 1 has been amended in an effort to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

With respect to the objection to Claims 3 and 4, the Examiner stated that "on the independent camera" (claim 3, line 16), "method" (claim 3, line 17) and "method" (claim 4, line 4) should be deleted. Claims 3 and 4 have been amended as per the Examiner's recommendations. Withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested, and as amended, Claims 3 and 4 should now be in condition for allowance.

With respect to the §112 rejection of Claims 1 and 3, the Examiner stated that "a posture/position control command" should be rewritten as --a posture and position control command-- in order to clarify the claimed limitation. Furthermore, with respect to the rejection of Claim 3, the Examiner stated that the first appearance of "a posture/position control command" on lines 11-12 should be rewritten as --a first posture and position control command-- and the second appearance of "a posture/position control command" on lines 14-15 be rewritten as --a second posture and position control command-- be also rewritten in order to clarify the claimed limitation. This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that both Claims 1 and 3 are clear and are in proper form as originally submitted. However, in order to expedite prosecution and to satisfy the Examiner, both Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to further clarify the claims in accordance with the recommendations of the Examiner and not for

purposes related to the statutory provisions for patentability. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

With respect to the §103(a) rejection of Claim 1, the Examiner stated that James et al. at col. 5, line 65 through col. 6, line 48, discloses “for photographing a subject for performing a call service and an image processing service including an operation of photographing a subject within the camera unit” (Office Action, page 4) allegedly as in Claim 1.

However, in contrast to amended Claim 1, James et al. merely discloses a medical video-teleconferencing and treatment system including a video conferencing unit (14, figure 1), an electronic signal transmitting receiving and processing unit (60, figure 2) including a camera unit (62, figure 2) and an emergency center cart (40, figure 2). The mobile communication terminal of James et al. merely transmits and receives electrical signals for a medical video-teleconferencing (See, col. 11, line 48 to col. 12, line 19 of James et al.). Nothing in James et al. teaches or suggests *performing a call service and an image processing/transmission service including an operation of photographing a subject with the camera unit*, as in Claim 1. Further in regard to Claim 1, the Examiner asserted that James et al. discloses all the elements of the claim except for the dynamic support for controlling a posture of the mounted mobile communication terminal and positional movement of the dynamic support upon receiving a posture control command and a position control command which is allegedly disclosed in Jouppi. In contrast to the invention of Claim 1, Jouppi merely discloses “a wireless communication transmitter/receiver 76 that transmits and receives signals from the wireless base station 78; the wireless base station 78 connects to the communication medium via a packet interface 704 such as ethernet or, alternately, a modem 706” (see Jouppi column 17, lines 50-54). Nowhere does Jouppi disclose a mobile communication terminal *detachably mounted on the dynamic support* of Claim 1, as amended. Consequently, Jouppi does not cure the defects of James et al. Therefore, amended Claim 1 is not made obvious by James et al. in view of Jouppi.

Claim 2 depends from independent Claim 1, therefore Claim 2 is not made obvious by James et al. in view of Jouppi for at least the reasons that Claim 1 is not made obvious by James

et al. in view of Jouppi.

In view of the above remarks and amendments, reconsideration and allowance of amended independent Claims 1 and 3 are respectfully requested. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2, 4 and 5, it is submitted that they are allowable by virtue of their dependencies on independent Claims 1 and 3, respectively.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-5 are believed to be in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/JWK:lah